

Anthony Harrigan

Charleston, S. C. News & Courier  
May 1, 1960

# Military Leadership

IT USED TO BE SAID that war is too serious a business to be left to the generals. But now days it seems that the military mind offers the best hope of this world-embattled nation.

It is the generals and the admirals — men such as Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. C. P. Cabell, USAF, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency — who are helping the nation face the totality of communist aggression.

These men study the threat to the national security — it is their profession — and know how the enemy works from the Caribbean to the China Sea.

IN REFRESHING CONTRAST to the State Department's refusal to face the facts in Cuba is the statement of Gen. Cabell in an appearance before Senate Committee on the Judiciary that "collaboration with and infiltration of popular movements, for example that of Batista in the 1930s and of Castro in the 1950s — has been communism's most effective weapon in Latin America."

Gen. Cabell boldly stated that the "so-called national liberation strategy seeks to offset communist numerical and political weakness through international organizational support and clandestine techniques of infiltration and coordination."

MILITARY LEADERS like Gen. Cabell are trying, in the face of foolish talk of coexistence, to explain to the American public how this nation is at war and that the hour is late for counter-attacks against the enemy.

One hopes that the American public will listen carefully to the statements of these military men. They serve as pathfinders and guides to the American people that must make transitions in thought and action in the years ahead.

The counsel of the military is in marked contrast to the unrealistic discussions of those civilian elements who urge disarmament and coexistence and who would block U.S. action by spreading fear of a nuclear holocaust.

The appearance of Castro, the H-bomb protest marchers, the advocates of recognition of Red China; the friends of vast U.S. financed United Nations programs (as a substitute for military defenses) are all of one mind: They would have the United States accept coexistence with the communist enemy and act passively and appeasingly before Red imperialism.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE should ignore the counsel of passivity before a terrible threat. They should remember George Washington's advice "to choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel."

The military leaders of the United States understand that this nation cannot win the war with communism by thinking or acting with passivity. They know that conflict cannot be avoided by

any treaty, any scrap of, paper or verbal agreement with the Soviet enemy. Conflict is the history of mankind. It is the history of our own time. We haven't the option now to choose whether or not we want war; we have it — and right in our own hemisphere.

EDMUND S. WHITMAN, vice president of the United Fruit Co. and an American company whose



BURKE

TAYLOR

properties in Cuba were recently confiscated for Soviet-style collectives, has said:

"The international communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere acts like the buzzards. The disciplined agents from Moscow hover over a country waiting for it to soften up to a point where they can move in and devour it."

The disciplined foreign agents know how to roll with the punch. Their ring tactics are highly flexible. Thus, when a movement by force fails, they adopt the Trojan horse tactic of temporary coexistence. That is the stratagem the free world is confronted with today.

THUS IT IS ABSURD for civilian officials to talk about avoiding all war. The task of true national leaders is not to run from conflict but to strengthen the will to win. They also have the task of shaping national policy in such a way that the outcome of the protracted war with communism will be favorable to the United States.

THE TRANSITIONS in thought and action that the military can help the American public make are from absurdity to realism in foreign relations.

American ideas about national conflict are vague and lacking in realism. The American approach to foreign relations is that peace and mutual satisfaction is natural among nations. Many citizens have the unsound notion that because various territories have their own flag that all nations are morally equal, that self-determination is a basic right the U. S. should respect in all instances.

This is folly. Castro's Cuba is not deserving of the same kind of respect as Canada. Neither is national self-determination in Castro's Cuba, where a communist Navy considers its Guantanamo front regime controls, as valid as base of too great importance to it is in England.

THAT EVERY PEOPLE has the right to choose its own kind of government, to go its own way — as in Castro's case forging links with Red China and the USSR — is a notion that handicaps the

United States in its struggle to preserve freedom against communist tyranny. It is this notion that leaves the United States unable to decide between the claims of an old friend and a new nation.

The Algerian situation is a case in point. The peculiar idea prevails that the Algerian rebels, who accepted aid from Red China's military advisors and who engage in terrorism, are deserving of no less consideration than France, a pillar of western civilization.

TOO OFTEN a spurious moralism becomes involved in national policy as a result of foolish ideas about the sovereignty and rights of foreign states. War becomes, in this view, a way to protect "rights" that are illusory.

Thus, after World War I President Wilson considered not U. S. strategic needs but the alleged rights of various Balkan peoples. At the conclusion of World War II, the same error was repeated.

America's Dutch allies were forced out of the East Indies. The result was a Javanese government that is leftist and no ally of the U. S. The spurious moralism resulted in denial of military aid to Chiang Kai-shek with the harrowing result of the loss of free China to world communism.

IMPRECISE, pseudo-moralistic aims have been the undoing of the United States since World War II. The only cautionary force in the United States have been the professional military people. The determination to hold Formosa stemmed from the military instance on its necessity. The Panama Canal Zone is still under firm U. S. control because the military regard it as essential. Spain is a free world bastion, no longer scorned by the U. S. gov.

ernment because the military know its importance for air and naval bases. And Cuba may be liberated from Castro because the Navy considers its Guantanamo base of too great importance to lose.

AMERICA'S BEST military minds share the idea that Prime Minister Palmerston once enunciated, namely that "England has no permanent friends; England has no permanent enemies; England has only permanent interests." If the United States keeps its eyes on its strategic interests, leaving aside other considerations, it will be able to resist communist attack.

Despite good counsel from the military, U. S. opinion is still a captive of the one-worlders, the co-existers, and the America lasters. Because of this the United States fares ill in foreign affairs. It will continue to fare badly until realism dominates in our national councils, and that means until the military, which is to say the strategic point of view, is more widely appreciated.

As George Santayana, the philosopher said, "Those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

WHAT THE American people must learn is to look at the world around them in a new way. They must look at it, with the United States and its interests always at the center — with one goal always in mind — U. S. survival.

The military leaders of the United States can play a great role in the education of Americans by constantly reminding their fellow citizens that the cold war they are in is the protracted war of communism against freedom.

This war may continue for decades the enemy's unchanging objective is defeat of the United States. "We will bury you," said Nikita Khrushchev. The only thing that will change is the method of communist attack. It may be conventional military operations, subversion, or the cultivation of a public philosophy of weakness, defeatism and appeasement in the U. S.

The military leaders of the United States can serve their countrymen by stressing time and again that in the struggle against communism there is no substitute for victory.